R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 611 JC 670 072

CATALOGING AND CLASSIFICATION IN JUNIOR COLLEGE LIBRARIES.

BY- ROWLAND, ARTHUR RAY

PUB DATE 63

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.28 7P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *LIBRARIES, *CATALOGING, PERSONNEL, COLLEGE LIBRARIES,

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES WERE RECEIVED FROM 336 (50 PERCENT) OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE LIBRARIES IN THE COUNTRY. THE DEWEY DECIMAL SYSTEM IS THE PREDOMINANT CLASSIFICATION SCHEME (96.5 PERCENT) WITH THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SYSTEM ACCOUNTING FOR THE REST. HOWEVER, 14.6 PERCENT INDICATED DEFINITE PREFERENCE FOR THE LC SYSTEM, AND 4.1 PERCENT STATED THAT SIZE OF THE COLLECTION WOULD DETERMINE THE PREFERENCE. MUCH LESS UNIFORMITY WAS FOUND IN THE ASSIGNMENT OF AUTHOR NUMBERS AND SUBJECT HEADINGS. PRINTED CARDS, WHEN AVAILABLE, WERE USED BY 86.2 PERCENT, WHILE 11 PERCENT REPRODUCED THEIR OWN CARDS (WITH 6.9 PERCENT APPARENTLY TYPING ALL CARDS INDIVIDUALLY). AT 71 PERCENT OF THE LIBRARIES, THE HEAD LIBRARIAN, USUALLY THE ONLY PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER, DID ALL THE CATALOGING. ALMOST TWO-THIRDS HAD CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR CATALOGING. ONLY HALF OF THE COLLEGES USED STUDENT HELP IN BOOK PROCESSING. THE AUTHOR CONCLUDES THAT THE GREATEST PROBLEM IN JUNIOR COLLEGE LIBRARIES IS LACK OF STAFF, PARTICULARLY CLERICAL WORKERS. PROFESSIONAL TIME AND ENERGY IS WASTED WHEN LIBRARIANS OCCUPY MUCH OF THEIR TIME IN CLERICAL DUTIES. (WO)

from: Library resources and technical services, 7: 254-258.

ERIC

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Cataloging and Classification in Junior College Libraries

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ARTHUR RAY ROWLAND, *Librarian*
Augusta College Library, Augusta, Ga.

ED013611

ALTHOUGH SEVERAL ARTICLES in recent years have dealt with cataloging and classification in various types of libraries, no one has considered the more than six hundred junior college libraries in the country. Eaton[1] (1955) surveyed only college and university libraries in *American Universities and Colleges;* and Johnston's[2] survey of junior college practices (1958) omitted cataloging and classification.

Recently I sent a questionnaire to all of the librarians of junior colleges in the "Directory of Junior Colleges,"[3] which represented all of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam. Replies were received from 336 or slightly more than 50 percent. Of those, 21 were not useful for various reasons. Replies were received from 46 states, the District of Columbia, and Guam.

Classification

Of these, 96.5 percent use the Dewey Decimal classification scheme and 3.5 percent use the Library of Congress classification scheme. No library reported using any other scheme, although two of those using Dewey use the Lynn-Patterson scheme for Religion.

Not all of the libraries, however, were satisfied with their present system of cataloging and classifying the collection. However, 13 libraries indicated that the potential size of the collection would determine whether they would use Dewey or LC. Table 1 indicates the type of system presently used and the type that the librarians would use if they were starting a new library.

TABLE 1

	Presently Used		Preferred	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Dewey Decimal System	304	96.5	229	72.7
Library of Congress Classification System	11	3.5	46	14.6
Dewey Decimal or Library of Congress System—depending on size			13	4.1
Bliss			1	.3
Lamont			1	.3
No Answer			25	8.0
	315	100%	315	100%

LC 670 072

The Eaton study[4] of college and university libraries revealed that 92.3 percent of libraries with collections under 25,000 use Dewey. Since 89 percent of the libraries replying to me had collections under 25,000 and 96 percent of my total replies use Dewey, it would seem that whether the library is a junior college or 4-year institution, Dewey is the prevalent scheme for smaller collections.

Nine libraries have changed classification systems in the past ten years, all except two to Dewey. Table 2 indicates changes made:

TABLE 2

System	Number
Local system to Dewey	4
Abridged Dewey Classification System to Dewey Classification System	2
Library of Congress Classification System to Dewey Classification System,	1
Dewey Classification System to Library of Congress Classification System	2

Author Number

With author or book numbers there has not been as much uniformity. A breakdown of the types of author number used is given in Table 3:

TABLE 3

	Number	Percentage
Cutter	106	33.6
Cutter-Sanborn	132	41.9
Library of Congress	4	1.3
Other	7	2.2
Author's Initial or Name	12	3.8
No Author Notation	54	17.2
Total	315	100%

Subject Headings

In the use of standard lists for subject headings there has not been as definite a pattern as was seen in the classification of schemes used. Of those libraries responding, 25 indicated that they used the subject headings which appeared on the printed cards which they received either from LC or Wilson without any checking to see if they conformed with current edition of standard list. Table 4 shows the standard list used:

TABLE 4

	Number	Percentage
Library of Congress	114	36.2
Sears	150	47.6
Sears and Library of Congress	26	8.2
None	25	8.0
Total	315	100%

Of the 114 using the Library of Congress List, 25 use both Wilson and LC cards and adapt the Sears headings on Wilson cards to conform to LC headings; two use in addition Kapsner for religious headings; and three also use *Reader's Guide* and *Book Review Digest* for additional subjects needed for material cataloged locally.

Even though a larger number (150) use Sears, more libraries in this group use additional aids in establishing headings with materials for which no printed cards were available. For religious material Kapsner is used by 5 libraries; 5 libraries use *Booklist*, 5 use *Reader's Guide* and 4 use *Book Review Digest* in combination with other aids.

Of those libraries which use both LC and Sears all indicated that they use LC headings on LC cards, Sears on Wilson cards or if original cataloging is necessary.

No cross references are made by 58 libraries. Even though 140 libraries use LC or LC in connection with Sears as a standard guide, only 97 make cross references from the LC list. Of the 150 libraries using Sears as the standard guide, 127 also use Sears for cross reference. One librarian indicates that they make whatever cross references seem logical.

Production of Catalog Cards

A percentage of 86.2 indicated that they use printed cards when available. Table 5 indicates the source and type of production of cards:

TABLE 5

	Number	Percentage
Library of Congress Cards	216	68.7
Wilson Cards	13	4.1
Both Wilson and Library of Congress Cards	42	13.4
Alanar	7	2.2
Other Centralized Processing	2	.6
Reproduce own cards	35	11.0
Total	315	100%

Of the 35 libraries which reproduce their own cards; only 13 use some type of mechanical reproduction method: 3 Chiang, 2 Ditto, 2 Multilith, 3 Cardmaster, 2 mimeographing, and 1 photoduplication. Eight of the 35 also order printed cards when available, indicating that 22 (or 6.9 percent) of the junior college libraries still type all catalog cards.

Staff

Who does the cataloging and typing is an acute problem because junior colleges for the most part have a small staff. Table 6 indicates who does the cataloging:

TABLE 6

	Number	Percentage
Full time cataloger	54	17.3
Asst. Librarian, in all cases also the only other professional	14	4.4
Clerk	9	2.8
Alanar or Centralized Processing	9	2.8
Head Librarian	223	70.8
Head Librarian and other professional members of staff	6	1.9
Total	315	100%

Of the 229 head librarians who catalog, 181 have no other professional librarian on the staff; 48 do have other professional assistants; and 9 of the libraries have 3 or more professional members on the staff. As indicated in Table 6, a clerk does the cataloging and classification of materials as well as the typing of catalog cards in 9 or 2.8 percent of the libraries.

Table 7 indicates the clerical assistance available for cataloging:

TABLE 7

No. of Clerks	No. of Libraries	Percentage
None	192	60.9
Less than 1	62	19.7
1	51	16.2
1½	4	1.3
2	6	1.9
Total	315	100%

In 80 percent of the 62 libraries with less than a full time adult clerk in cataloging, this is the only clerical employee the library has. Table 8 indicates the type of employee who actually types catalog cards:

TABLE 8

	No. of Libraries	Percentage
Clerk	123	39.1
Student Assistant	109	34.6
Librarian	83	26.3
Total	315	100%

Only 50.1 percent of the libraries use any students in the processing of books. Table 9 indicates the number of libraries and amount of student help per week in cataloging:

TABLE 9

	No. of Libraries
Under 5 hours	16
5–9 hours	41
10–19 hours	48
20–30 hours	31
30 or more hours	7
Varies according to need	15
Total	158

Conclusions

The Dewey Decimal classification scheme is used very widely in junior college libraries. However, not all librarians are satisfied that this would be the best scheme to use if they were starting a new library. Relatively few have made any changes because of the problems involved and because of the lack of staff.

The biggest problem which faces the junior college library is lack of staff, particularly clerical staff. When librarians in 26.3 percent of the libraries have to do all of the typing and processing of books there is a gross waste of professional time and energy. Most of the librarians, by their comments, recognize that they are not doing the best job, but feel that they can not do a more thorough job without clerical help. With 20 percent of the libraries making no cross references for subjects used, it would seem that there is a need for the improvement of this area.

REFERENCES

1. Eaton, Thelma, "Classification in College and University Libraries," *College and Research Libraries*. 16:168-176, April 1955.
2. Johnston, W. T., "A glance at junior college libraries." *Junior College Journal*. 29:-195-202, December 1958.
3. "Junior College Directory, 1961," *Junior College Journal*. 31:267-302, January 1961.
4. Eaton, *op. cit.*

RECLASSIFICATION PROJECTS

Among libraries undergoing reclassification are the University of Maryland (from Dewey to LC) and the University of Malaya (from Bliss to LC)